



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/626,535	07/27/2000	Donald F. Hooper	42390. P7876X	1214
7590	02/17/2004		EXAMINER	
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP 12400 Wilshire Boulevard Seventh Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026			ENG, DAVID Y	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	
			DATE MAILED: 02/17/2004	

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Offic Action Summary</b>	<b>Application N .</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/626,535	HOOPER ET AL.
	<b>Examin r</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	DAVID Y. ENG	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears in the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. .
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.   |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

The active claims are 1-17.

Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1 and 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mohamed (USP 6,366,998).

Claims 2-6 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mohamed (USP 6,366,998) in view of Anderson (USP 3,736,566).

Details of the rejections have already been set forth in the last Office action. The details are incorporated herein by reference thereto.

With respect to the section 112 rejection of claim 3, there is no amendment to claim 3. There is no explanation as to why the second and not the first thread retrieves the state information. Note that the state information is saved by the first thread and not by the second thread. Note further that there is no apparent reason why the second thread has use of the state information saved by the first thread. The Examiner has carefully studied the excerpts identified by Applicants. There is no description as to why state information saved by one thread is retrieved by other thread in processing network data.

Scope of claim 6 is not clear because the entire claim does not make sense. Parent claim 1 calls for a method of processing network data. Providing state

information to transmit circuitry as claimed absolutely has no utility let alone processing network data. Further, there is no functional relationship between step of claim 6 and its parent claims. It is not clear what claim 6 tries to accomplish.

In Applicants' remarks directed to the 103 Rejection, Applicants contended that Mohamed does not teach "scheduling a second thread to process a second incoming block of data prior to the first thread completing". The technical term for that is "parallelism" which is well known in the art. See figure 1 in Mohamed. The scheduler is for scheduling of different threads to the plurality of DPUs for processing data simultaneously. See the term "parallelism" in Figure 8 and in the patent of Mohamed.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.



DAVID Y. ENG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER